UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,106	02/15/2006	Angus Reardon	REAR0101PUSA	2673
22045 BROOKS KUS	7590 09/17/200 HMAN P.C.	EXAMINER		
1000 TOWN C	ENTER	BAYOU, AMENE SETEGNE		
TWENTY-SEC SOUTHFIELD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3746	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/17/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/595,106	REARDON, ANGUS	
Examiner	Art Unit	
AMENE S. BAYOU	3746	
	10/595,106 Examiner	10/595,106 REARDON, ANGUS Examiner Art Unit

	AMENE S. BAYOU	3746	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 09 September 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ).	g date of the final rejectio FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. .ED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply original controls.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ite extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENIAN.</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be  (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NOT »);	E below);	
<ul><li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or</li></ul>	er form for appear by materially rec	auding of simplifying tr	ie issues ioi
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inplication among the (1	102 021).
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmen	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an ex	planation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,5-8,10-16,18,20 and 22-25</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>3,4,9,17,19,21</u> .			
<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u> 8.	hefore or on the date of filing a No	tice of Appeal will not	he entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	າ of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Devon C Kramer/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3746			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Dependent Claim 10 and independent claim 23 as amended both recite that "one section of the pair of sections is hingedely attached to the other section of the pair of sections at adjacent respective ends of each of the sections". Because of the the new recited structural limitations in the amended calim the grounds of rejection will be changed. However a response to applicant's argument to the other claims is discusses as follows. In re claim 1, applicant amended the same by canceling dependent claim 4 and incorporate the limitation of claim 4 in claim 1 and argued that (see page 3, first paragraph) since Straus and Ellison teach a floating apparatus, the combination of references teach away from claim 1 which require that the "hollow body is nonfloatable in a pool of water". Examiner respectifully disagrees. Strauss in column 5 lines 24-25 discuss that the collection unit is held in place by mooring lines. Ellison in column 3, lines 36-37 discussed that the tramp oil collector can be floating or stationary. Thus one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made could make the fluid collecting apparatus to be stationary as taught by Ellison for structural stability against turbulence and associated loading. The response to applicant's argument to the rejection of claims 14 and 20 (see page 3) will be the same since applicant is arguing on the same point as that of claim 1.